

Table 13
Summary Comparison of Impacts

RESOURCES				
	<i>No Action (Alternative A)</i>	<i>Alternative B</i>	<i>Alternative C</i>	<i>Alternative D</i>
<i>Air Quality</i>				
	Air quality would be protected though short-term impacts could occur from fire events, prescribed fire activities, slash burning, or dust generated by activities such as motorized use or mining.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
<i>Cultural Resources</i>				
	Provides protection and attention to cultural resources through both Section 106 compliance activities and proactive management.	Provides more protection and attention to cultural resources than A and D. Would increase amount of cultural resource information base through increased proactive inventory, but less inventory than Alternative C.	Provides the most protection and attention to cultural resources. Provides the largest increase in cultural resource information with more proactive inventory than A, B, or D.	Provides less protection and attention to cultural resources than B and C, but focuses on priority watersheds to provide for more comprehensive management in concert with other resources.
	More designated motorized routes in this alternative provide the most access to areas where indirect impacts can occur from vandalism, etc.	Provides better protection from indirect impacts resulting from designated motorized routes than A or D, but less than C.	Least number of designated motorized routes provides best protection from indirect impacts to cultural resources.	Provides better protection from indirect impacts related to use of designated motorized routes than A but less than B or C.
<i>Fish and Wildlife</i>				
<i>Fish</i>				
	Would take longer than Alternatives B and C to achieve DFC.	Would reach DFC sooner than Alternative A, but after Alternative C.	Would achieve DFC before all other alternatives.	Would achieve DFC about the same time as Alternative B.
	Protects fish habitat using watershed planning and rangeland health standards, implementing habitat improvements projects where site-specific assessments have identified habitat concerns.	Similar to Alternative A, but provides additional protection to Class I streams to improve fish habitat.	Similar to Alternative B, but provides additional focus on special status species.	Same as Alternative A.

Wildlife				
	Would reach DFC in longer timeframes than Alternatives B and C.	Would reach DFC more quickly than Alternatives A and D, but less quickly than C.	Would reach the DFC before other alternatives.	Would take the longest to reach DFC.
	Overall wildlife habitats would be maintained and conditions enhanced as individual projects and plans are developed and implemented.	Forested and sagebrush habitats would be enhanced but with a higher risk than Alternatives A and C of localized wildlife displacement. The loss of certain wildlife species and uses due to more active and widespread modification of forested communities, particularly in focus areas would also be greater than in Alternatives A and C. Short-term habitat losses and wildlife displacement would be compensated by increased habitat diversity over the long-term.	Wildlife habitat would sustain the least human-caused disturbance, with natural disturbances and succession having a greater influence on habitat conditions. Wildlife species dependent taller and denser plant communities with more structure would benefit.	More widespread impacts to forest and sagebrush habitats would occur under this alternative with highest risk of wildlife displacement and disruption of seasonal uses. Improvement in riparian/wetland habitat conditions would be slow.
		Riparian and wetland habitat would be actively managed to meet DFCs but improvement would be slower than Alternative C.		
Geologic Resources				
	Unique geologic features would be protected from locatable mineral activities.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.	Same as Alternative A.
Paleontological Resources				
	Similar to impacts described for Cultural Resources.			

<i>Soils</i>				
	Greatest risk for soil erosion due the greatest number of miles of routes designated for motorized use.	Fewer miles of designated routes would result in less risk of erosion than in Alternative A.	Potential for erosion would be the least over the life of the plan under this alternative since the fewest number of miles of roads would be designated as open to motorized travel.	Potential erosion resulting from routes designated for motorized travel would be more than in Alternatives B and C, but less than Alternative A.
	Streambank erosion would be greatest under this alternative given the miles of riparian areas in NF and FAR condition.	Streambank erosion would decrease under this alternative as riparian conditions improve.	Streambank erosion would be of least concern under this alternative.	Streambank erosion would be alleviated over the long term based on proposed riparian management.
	Some soil erosion from vegetation treatments would occur until vegetation regenerates.	Soil erosion from vegetation treatments would be greater than Alternative A and C, but less than Alternative D. Impacts would first occur in three focus areas.	Soil erosion from vegetative treatments would more than Alternative A but less than Alternatives B and D.	Soil erosion from vegetation treatments would be the greatest under this alternative given the number of acres proposed for treatment under this alternative.
<i>Special Status Species—Animals</i>				
	Habitat suitability and conditions would be protected and improved in specific areas.	Habitat suitability and conditions would be enhanced across broader areas of the landscape.	Similar to Alternative B.	Habitat suitability and conditions have the most potential to be altered due to vegetation treatments proposed in this alternative.
	Impacts to special status species movement and migration would be more likely to occur with localized case-by-case management.	Management of corridor areas to prevent fragmentation would enhance habitat and linkages available for special status species.	Impacts from management of wildlife corridors would be the same as Alternative B with some additional protection for wolves and grizzly bear movement.	Same as Alternative A.
		Specific management for special status species emphasizes habitat protection and improvements for grizzly bear, sage grouse, and migratory birds on a broad scale.	Management enhances habitat condition and availability for special status species the same as Alt. B but also emphasizes more specific habitat protection and improvement for sensitive species on a broad scale.	Management would benefit grizzly bear most, and other special status species to a lesser degree.

Special Status Species–Fish

Would take longer to reach DFC.

Would achieve DFC in less time than Alternative A and D, but longer than Alternative C.

Would achieve DFC in the shortest amount of time.

Would achieve DFC in similar timeframes to Alternative B.

Uses conservation strategy to manage and protect westslope cutthroat trout habitat.

Same as Alternative A, but also protects concentrated spawning areas in streams with westslope cutthroat trout populations of 99% and greater purity.

Provides protection for WCT streams with 90% and above pure populations by withdrawing those streams from mineral entry and in management of WCT spawning and fry emergence habitats.

Same as Alternative A.

Special Status Species–Plants

Protects special status plants using watershed planning and rangeland health standards.

Provides additional protection for special status plants by minimizing surface disturbance from authorized activities and by implementing habitat management plans for priority species in riparian/wetland habitat and in sagebrush-steppe habitats.

Provides more protection for special status plants than Alternatives A and B by implementing habitat management plans on a broader scale specifically for plant values.

Impacts would be similar to Alternative B.

Increases information base on special status plants by partnering with others performing inventory on public lands.

Increases information base on special status plants to a greater degree than Alternative A through inventory of project areas as well as through partnerships.

Same as Alternative B.

Same as Alternative B.

Vegetation—Forests and Woodlands

DFC would be achieved over longer periods of time than in Alternatives B and D.

Emphasis on treatment of vegetation that has missed two or more fire cycles would restore a more natural fire regime on a localized basis, mainly in the Pioneer and Gravelly landscapes.

Aspen would be restored in particular areas over time.

Forest and woodland vegetation within WSA boundaries would continue to evolve with fire suppression.

Would achieve DFC more quickly than Alternatives A and C, but less quickly than Alternative D. More acres of Douglas-fir (warm/dry) forest types would be treated than in Alternative A, but less than proposed in Alternative D.

Three areas identified as priorities for treatment

- southern Rubys
- south Tobacco Roots
- Barton/Idaho Gulch

would be restored sooner than other areas in the DFO.

Would treat more acres for aspen restoration than Alternative A, but less than Alternative D.

Wilderness values could be enhanced over the long term by vegetation treatments that would return forest and woodlands in these areas to a more natural fire regime.

DFC would be achieved most slowly, treating fewer acres in most forest types, some not at all, and by limiting the types of tools that can be used outside of aspen restoration and wildland-urban interface areas.

Would restore the same amount of aspen over time as in Alternative B.

Wilderness values could be enhanced with the use of prescribed natural fire.

Would achieve DFC sooner than other alternatives, treating the most acres in all forest types and using all tools.

Aspen would be restored to a slightly greater degree under this alternative.

Wilderness values could be enhanced over the long term as in Alternative B.

Vegetation—Invasive and Non-native species, including Noxious Weeds

Introduction and spread of noxious weeds would continue.

Noxious weed threats would be reduced by using all tools and strategies to control weeds.

Similar to A, but risks of impacts to values such as special status plants, occupied pygmy rabbit habitat, sage grouse breeding habitat, and mountain mahogany habitats would be weighed against noxious weed risks when determining control strategies.

Prohibition of aerial application of herbicides and pesticides could increase costs and possibly reduce effectiveness of noxious weed control in specific areas.

Impacts would be similar to Alternative A, except the potential for the greatest amount of disturbance under this alternative could increase the introduction and spread of weeds to a greater degree than any of the other alternatives.

Vegetation–Rangelands

DFC would be achieved over longer periods of time than in Alternatives B and D.

Would achieve DFC more quickly than Alternatives A and C, but less quickly than Alternative D, allowing use of all tools as appropriate.

DFC would be achieved most slowly, treating vegetation to mimic specified fire return intervals with limited tools for most habitat types in areas outside of aspen restoration and wildland-urban interface areas.

Would achieve DFC sooner than other alternatives, treating the most acres in all shrub types using all tools.

Three areas identified as priorities for treatment

- southern Rubys
- south Tobacco Roots
- Barton/Idaho Gulch

would be restored sooner than other areas in the DFO.

Vegetation–Riparian and Wetlands

Riparian habitat conditions would be managed for PFC with improvement occurring as individual projects and plans are developed and implemented.

This alternative would provide faster improvement than Alternatives A and D toward DFC by actively manipulating vegetation communities and implementing grazing management designed to meet DFC.

Riparian and wetland habitat would sustain the least human-caused disturbance and achieve DFC before the other alternatives. Natural disturbances and succession would have a greater influence on habitat in this alternative.

Progress toward DFC would be slower than Alternatives B and C.

Progress toward DFC would be the slowest under this alternative because riparian areas would be managed for PFC in many cases and not for DFC.

Alternative C would provide the most rapid improvement in riparian/wetland condition by implementing some of the same vegetation restoration projects as in Alternative B combined with the effect of not grazing some habitats, implementing rest or deferred grazing treatments or limiting forage utilization by livestock.

Limiting riparian restoration treatments to only aspen types would also slow progress toward DFC.

Visual Resources

Visual quality could be impaired, especially in areas of mineral development and vegetative treatments.

Visual quality could be impaired as in Alternative A, but application of management objectives and rehabilitation measures would reduce impacts.

Visual quality would most likely remain the same as at present under Alternative C management, except for increased potential for catastrophic fire events.

Visual quality would deteriorate the most under this alternative given the greatest amount of disturbance proposed to manage other resources and provide for uses and the increase in acres assigned to VRM Class IV compared to Alternatives B and C.

Water

Achieving water quality goals with proposed riparian management would take the longer than Alternatives B and C, but probably less time than Alternative D.

Potential for water quality impacts would be less than D, but more than those projected under Alternatives B and C given the mix of uses and surface disturbing activities proposed in those alternatives.

Continued fire suppression could result in an increase in erosion resulting from wildfire because fuels would continue to accumulate and increase the chance of large wildfires.

Water quality goals would be attained more quickly than Alternatives A and D but less quickly than Alternative C.

Increasing surface disturbance from vegetation treatments and other actions could increase short term impacts under this alternative in comparison to Alternative A. Reducing the number of miles of roads open to motorized use would decrease the potential for water quality impacts from erosion.

Under this alternative erosion resulting from wildfire would be moderate in comparison to Alternatives C and D. This is because the combination of fuels reduction and vegetation treatments would be more moderate than for Alternative C and D.

Water quality goals would be achieved most quickly under this alternative.

Potential for water quality impacts would be the least compared to other alternatives given that less surface disturbing activities would occur under this alternative.

Erosion resulting from wildfire would be similar to Alternative A.

Water quality goals would be achieved in the greatest length of time.

The greatest potential for short term impacts to water quality would occur under this alternative from reduction of surface cover due to vegetation treatments and forest product activities, as well as other surface-disturbing activities such as mining.

Erosion resulting from wildfire would be the least under this alternative because the combination of fuels reduction and vegetative treatments would be the greatest.

Wild Horses and Burros

There are no wild horse or burro herds within the planning area.